

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 16-0881 FMO (SSx)	Date	April 28, 2017
Title	Sakura Finetek U.S.A., Inc. v. Sci Gen, Inc., <u>et al.</u>		

Present: The Honorable	Fernando M. Olguin, United States District Judge
------------------------	--

Vanessa Figueroa	None
------------------	------

Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder	Tape No.
--------------	---------------------------	----------

Attorney Present for Plaintiff(s):	Attorney Present for Defendant(s):
------------------------------------	------------------------------------

None Present	None Present
--------------	--------------

Proceedings: (In Chambers) Order to Show Cause Re: Sanctions for Failure to Comply with Settlement Requirements

Pursuant to the Court's Case Management Order of June 29, 2016, the parties were originally required to complete their settlement conference by December 30, 2016, (see Dkt. 28, Court's Order of June 29, 2016, at 17). This deadline was extended several times. (See Dkt. 56, Court's Order of November 28, 2016, at 1 (January 31, 2017); Dkt. 66, Court's Order of December 9, 2016, at 1 (March 1, 2017); Dkt. 69, Court's Order of December 22, 2016, at 1 (April 1, 2017); Dkt. 90, Stipulation to Extend Non-Expert and Expert Discovery Dates at 2 (April 7, 2017)).

In the parties' April 20, 2017, Stipulation to Continue Deadlines for Settlement Conference [] (Dkt. 94, "Stipulation"), and the April 25, 2017, New Stipulation for Short Continuance of Settlement Conference [] (Dkt. 96, "New Stipulation"), the parties contend that "Judge Segal proposed scheduling [a settlement conference] for April 7, 2017," which "some of the parties and insurance representatives" could not attend, (Dkt. 94, Stipulation at 2), and that "[d]espite numerous good faith attempts to find a date that worked for Judge Segal and the others, it appears that a date in June is the earliest date that would work for everyone." (Id.; Dkt. 96, New Stipulation at 2). The parties seek to hold a settlement conference before a private mediator on May 17, 2017, (see Dkt. 94, Stipulation at 2; Dkt. 96, New Stipulation at 2), but have not identified the name of that private mediator or confirmed whether a deposit holding the May 17, 2017, date with that unnamed private mediator has been made. (See, generally, Dkt. 94, Stipulation; Dkt. 96, New Stipulation).

Based on For the foregoing, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. The parties' Stipulations (**Document Nos. 94 and 96**) are **rejected**. The parties shall comply with all the deadlines set forth in the Court's Order of March 23, 2017 (Dkt. 93).

2. Lead counsel and a representative for each party knowledgeable about the parties' efforts to conduct settlement proceedings and authorized to make decisions on behalf of each party shall attend a hearing on **Thursday, May 25, 2017, at 10:00 a.m.** in Courtroom 6D of the

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. **CV 16-0881 FMO (SSx)**

Date **April 28, 2017**

Title **Sakura Finetek U.S.A., Inc. v. Sci Gen, Inc., et al.**

First Street Courthouse to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for failure to comply with the court's orders.¹

Initials of Preparer 00 : 00
vdr

¹ In the event the parties go forward with the settlement conference set with the unidentified mediator and settle the case, the filing of a notice of settlement prior to the hearing shall be deemed a sufficient response to this Order to Show Cause.